PTO/SB/21 REV 1 (12/97)
Approved for use through 09/30/2000. omb 0651-0032
Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

TP		Application Number	10/749,729	
杨		Filing Date	December 30, 2003	
TRANSMITTAL FO	RM	First Named Inventor	Jeffrey A. Humber	
Ito be used for all correspondence after in	itial filing)	Group Art Unit	3751	
1834PH		Examiner Name	Unknown	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	7.	Attorney Docket Number	1896-059	

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)										
Certified Copy of Document(s) Response to Mis Incomplete Appli	ed ponse e Request nment Request osure Statement Priority sing Parts/		After Allowance Communication to Group Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Proprietary Information Status Letter Additional Enclosure(s) (please identify below): POSTCARD POSTCARD Beconsideration Under 37 CFR §1.111 in September 22, 2005; and a prepaid Return this time.							
	Si	 GNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AC	SENT							
Firm or Individual Name Signature Date	(Atty) Michael H Reg. No.	I. Jester	✓ ✓							
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING										
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail (postage pre-paid) in an envelope addressed to: MS - AMENDMENT - NO FEE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on this date: October 7, 2005										
Typed or printed name	Michael H. Jest	ter								
Signature	my	8. Of	Date 16-7-65 /							

OCT 1 2 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

in re Patent a	pplication of:)			
Jeffry A. Humber)	Confirmation No.:		9048
Serial No.:	10/0749,729)	Group Art Unit:		3751
Filed:	December 30, 2003)	Examiner:	Charl	les E. Phillips
For: <i>Close</i> <i>Retai</i>	t Flange with Knock out ner)			

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 CFR §1.111

MS - AMENDMENT - NO FEE Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the third, non-final Office Action mailed September 22, 2005, please reconsider the patentability of the pending claims based on the following remarks.

In the third Office Action, Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-12 and 14-18 were rejected for alleged obviousness over Fell, Sr. in view of Pisklula. Because of the amendments to independent Claim 20, the examiner advised that Claim 20 stands as withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 11-12 and 14-19 were rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The examiner cites Fig. 3 of Fell, Sr., and alleges that it would have been obvious in light of Piskula "to provide for the knockout of the former (Fell, Sr.) to be located and sized as taught by the latter (Piskula) in order to prevent entry into the pipe." This obviousness rejection is respectfully traversed.